



ATTACHMENT C

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Figures 1 and 2 of record with new Figures 1-4, with amended drawings in accordance with the Examiner's request.



ATTACHMENT D

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the thorough Examination to date. Applicant has made an effort to fully respond to all the issues raised by the Examiner. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, the Specification has been amended to:

- A) Correct clerical errors;
- B) To correctly describe the drawings views;
- C) To better describe the present invention, and
- D) To insert statements of invention in containing the language from the claims so that the claims will be consistent with the specification

In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to make this claim clear and to overcome minor objections to the claim language and more clearly show how this claim is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Applicant has amended Claim 3, which depends from amended Claim 1, so as to make this claim more clear as well. Claims 2, 4 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are patentable for at least the following reasons.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawing figures and to the title of the invention. Without addressing the merits of these objections, these objections have become moot in that Applicant provides herewith replacement drawing figures

which overcome the objections, and the title has been amended as well. In particular, Applicant has amended the drawings to correctly represent a metallic material and to correctly represent all features of the invention, and no new matter has been entered.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 on the basis that the claims were indefinite. Applicant submits that the present amendments to the claims overcome all such objections.

In the Official Action, Claims 1-5 were rejected as anticipated by Dudley et al. (US 4,448,027). Claim 1 has been amended to better describe the invention and also to include all limitations of dependent Claims 2 and 4 and some limitations from dependent Claim 3. No new matter has been entered and support for the amendments can be found in the specification. New independent Claim 1 is now a combination of the features of original Claims 2 and 4 and some limitations from dependent Claim 3, describing a novel and non-obvious apparatus. Applicant submits that this rejection, insofar as applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn for the reasons that follow.

Dudley et al. discloses a conveyorized microwave oven having two leakage suppression tunnels in series wherein the first tunnel includes a microwave choke and a second tunnel has a ferromagnetic layer covered with a smooth microwave transparent sheet. The leakage suppression tunnels in Dudley comprises two tunnels, a choke tunnel and attenuation tunnel, attached to one another in sequence, being the second tunnel connected to the second end of the first tunnel. Microwave leakage from the oven is substantially eliminated by the combination of the choke tunnel and the attenuation tunnel 18. Differently from Dudley et al. the microwave blocker apparatus

for open microwave ovens of the present invention comprises only one piece, and this only one piece is sufficient to prevent the leakage of microwaves applied to open microwave ovens and allowing for a continuous, uniform, safe and mainly, faster operation.

Additionally, the suppression tunnel described in Dudley can only operate when used with the specific conveyorized microwave oven, as described in Claim 1 therein, while the microwave blocker apparatus of the present invention can be adapted to different kinds and shapes of microwave ovens. Applicant fails to comprehend on what basis and from what source the Examiner concluded the allegations on the dimensions and forms, and respectfully submits that no mention exist in Dudley that the tunnels dimensions and forms follow any oven's shape in which is installed.

Although the description of Figures 5-8 in Dudley cites the use of a dielectric material, Figures 5-8 show the sequential steps in the fabrication of the top of attenuation tunnel. The steps are time consuming and complicated if compared with the chamber of the present invention, which has an opening with a cover appropriate to introduction and reposition of substances, making it much easier and practical its fabrication. Additionally, with the configuration of the chamber of the present invention, the substance used inside the chamber can be substituted as required or desired. These features are not taught or suggested in Dudley.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dudley does not anticipate or make obvious the present claims, in particular in view of the clear differences between the present invention and the leakage suppression tunnel for conveyorized microwave oven

disclosed by Dudley et al., and that the Examiner's rejection is traversed and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-5 on the basis of Edgar US Patent 3,749,874 ("Edgar"). In particular, the Examiner argues that Edgar shows a microwave tunnel oven, however without any further details. In connection with Edgar, Applicant submits that Edgar provides a microwave applicator including an entrance and exit waveguide tunnel means abutting a specific oven enclosure in which a first portion dimension specifically accommodates the width of the transporting means used with the microwave applicator. A first important difference between Edgar and the microwave blocker apparatus for open microwave ovens of the present invention is that the waveguide in Edgar can also only operate when used with the specific conveyorized microwave heating apparatus, as described in Claim 1 therein, while the microwave blocker apparatus of the present invention can be adapted to different kinds and shapes of microwave ovens.

A second fundamental difference is that the waveguide in Edgar operates based in its dimensions (to provide a cutoff frequency wavelength characteristic) and in the use of an energy absorbing medium coated on all of the inside walls or impregnated in panels of insulating materials to form a layer provided with the materials. Differently from Edgar, the microwave blocker of the present invention, not only can be adapted to different kinds and shapes of microwave ovens, but also provides a chamber containing a substance capable of absorbing microwaves generated by the microwave oven, with a volume, quantity and thickness capable to attend a security standard for levels of

exposition to the microwaves generated by the microwave oven. This feature is not described or mentioned in Edgar.

Applicants respectfully submit that Edgar does not anticipate or make obvious the present claims, and that the Examiner's rejection on the basis of this reference is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome by the above amendments and arguments, and thus request immediate allowance of the patent application.

END OF REMARKS